

Meeting of 1998-1-06 Special Meeting

MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING  
LAWTON CITY COUNCIL  
JANUARY 6, 1998 - 6:00 P.M.  
WAYNE GILLEY CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Charles Beller, Mayor Pro Tem, Also Present:  
Presiding Gil Schumpert, City Manager  
(Mayor Marley entered at 6:30 p.m.) John Vincent, Sr. Asst. City Attorney  
Brenda Smith, City Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Pro Tem Beller who announced that Mayor Marley was in Oklahoma City on city business and would return during the meeting. Notice of meeting and agenda were posted on the City Hall bulletin board as required by State law.

ROLL CALL

Present : Jody Maples, Ward One  
Richard Williams, Ward Two  
Jeff Sadler, Ward Three  
John Purcell, Ward Four  
Robert Shanklin, Ward Five  
Charles Beller, Ward Six  
Randy Warren, Ward Eight

Absent: Carol Green, Ward Seven

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1. Consider approval of the proposed Capital Improvement Plan for the City Lakes for FY 97-98. Exhibits: Proposed FY 97-98 CIP.

Beller said there had been discussion on whether the master plan should come first or this item. Schumpert said this was requested to be heard during a special meeting to allow time for discussion and a separate document had been provided showing \$25,000 carried forward from the 1996 budget, and the amount in the current budget of \$50,000, as well as donations, for a total of \$83,000 that could be spent for lakes CIP.

Dick Huck, Parks & Recreation Director, said abatement and removal of underground storage tanks at School House Slough will require funding and that is included tonight as Item 10. He said \$3,000 was put in escrow by Mrs. Moore toward that project, and Council will have items at the next regular meeting to proceed with the project. Engineering cost has been identified as \$3,000 and the removal at \$16,000. Huck said the other items are listed by priority based on the recommendation of the Lake & Land Commission.

Huck said Items One and Two are major repairs to two restrooms in the public camp ground and the day use area at Lake Lawtonka. The facilities are over 25 years old, the basic structures are sound but should be gutted and renovated at a cost of \$14,000 and \$14,500 respectively. Williams asked if this is using in-house labor. Huck said yes, the amounts shown do not include labor. Williams asked if there was a list of repairs. Huck said it would be new fixtures, partitions, fiberglass board on the exterior walls, counter tops, and a list had been prepared which came to about \$11,000 and more was added for items that may come up during construction.

Shanklin asked if \$14,000 would be spent on materials alone and Huck said yes. Shanklin said he would like to see the materials list and that the restrooms are in very sad condition, appearing to have had no maintenance at all. He asked who was supposed to have been maintaining them. Huck said the lake staff, and if needed, a work order is sent to building maintenance which works on such projects during the winter. Shanklin said he was not proud to say those were owned by the City of Lawton, that he would have to know what was planned before approving \$14,000, and that this was not the first time funding had been approved for these facilities during the last 25 years. Huck said the structure was built 25 years ago and major renovation was done eight to nine years ago.

Huck said Item Three is to construct a new pavilion for group use similar to the facility in Elmer Thomas Park. A \$5,000 donation is pending from the lake association to put toward the project; estimated cost is \$15,000. Shanklin asked if this would be like the pavilion with the fire place. Huck said no, it would be like the one behind the Boy Scout facility where the old ABC ball field was located, it will seat 80 to 100 people, and would be available by reservation and payment of a fee.

Shanklin asked if this is part of the master plan. Huck said there was discussion about having large group use pavilions. Shanklin said the commentary states "until the Lake Lawtonka master plan was completed to insure the staffs recommendations are in line with this master plan" and asked if this is in the master plan. Huck said yes, pavilions are identified as a need. Beller asked if the Lake Ellsworth master plan had been completed. Huck said no, it has not been started. Shanklin said he attended the Lake & Land Commission where a man made a presentation saying not to do anything with the west side and the land use is 110% now, and in ten years, you would have to let some in after letting some out, but the recommendation is spending \$15,000 for a pavilion when the lake is being overused.

Purcell said according to the commentary, the master plan for Lake Lawtonka is complete and he asked if Council had approved it. Huck said yes, and at the same time, approval was given to develop the implementation of that master plan. Maples asked if this is the master plan that was done by the college that she said was a worthless study. Huck said yes and we are in the process of developing implementation of those recommendations and that will be completed by April.

Purcell asked what would be done in terms of the City's participation and running of camp grounds according to the master plan or implementation plan; will the City continue running camp grounds and renting them out in somewhat of a competition with concessions. Huck said one of the recommendations in the report was that the City would operate the camp grounds in the day use areas. Purcell said Council has not approved continuing that, although it was a recommendation from the feasibility study, and asked if that was correct. Huck said Council has final disposition in the implementation plan as to whether we contract out additional areas for privatization of camp grounds, day use areas, and various recreational activities. Purcell said he did not understand why the City would spend \$15,000 to build a pavilion in an area which may be eventually leased to a concession to run, as opposed to letting the concession operator do that construction. Purcell said Huck is calling this the master plan, but there was a feasibility study, and the master plan is yet to come; the implementation plan is the master plan and Council has not approved that. He said there are certain areas that need attention, such as the sea wall, regardless of who runs the operations. Purcell said if the storage tanks must be removed and the City is responsible for it, that obviously must be done. He said the master plan would have a bearing on the other items before taxpayer dollars are spent because the concession operators may build facilities.

Maples said it was her understanding that the City accepted the plan only so payment could be made for that portion of it but did not approve it. Purcell said he looked at it as a feasibility study because there was no plan, and the master plan would come in with the implementation. Maples said she is heavily involved in research and the type of research that was done is the most worthless type of study that can be done and Council should seriously consider that before approving some of the recommendations.

Shanklin said he saw a map on a wall showing facilities. Schumpert said it did not contain details and until you can see the dots on the chart showing what is being done and who is doing it, then some members are reluctant to spend money on some of the activities. Purcell said that was what he was saying because on the feasibility study, he did not remember them saying the facilities should be City operated or contracted out, and that must be determined first as part of the master plan, as well as where the facilities would be built. Schumpert said they are to show the facilities and maximum use of the area for the various activities, then you say some should be done privately, or have public restrooms, or a certain area that would be totally public, and all of those decisions would be made after you see how they intend to fully develop the area for optimum use.

Shanklin said he did not see how any money could be spent at the lakes until something is done to the restrooms due to their deplorable condition where people have to wade into them during the summer. He asked Huck where he would spend the first \$100 as the highest priority. Huck said the highest use area is the east restroom, and if the condition of the restrooms is not acceptable, people would not likely return. Shanklin said he also wanted to get out of the business of mowing and that nobody had showed him a list of what they had done for eight hours. Shanklin said he carried a hammer and tape measure and a person would be surprised what they could accomplish if they wanted to maintain something and that maintenance is not being done.

Beller suggested Huck complete the items on the list and Council would then decide. Shanklin asked if the City owns the restrooms at School House Slough and Robinsons Landing. Huck said yes, all restrooms at the lakes are public restrooms operated and maintained by the City. Shanklin said there must be three to four times the amount of activity at School House Slough than at Robinsons Landing, and they are the same size, and asked why a study was requested. Huck said the issue with Robinsons Landing is Item Nine, and an issue brought up several years ago when the restroom was replaced was that the permit from the Health Department allow us to put back only the same number of water closets as was in the old concrete block building due to capacity of the leach field. When the Robinsons Landing master plan was approved several years ago, limitations were included where camp grounds could not be added because of the limited amount of restroom facilities. Shanklin asked if a holding tank could be placed below the hill. Huck said those are some of the options or you have to pump it or have a lagoon system. Huck said the same problem existed at School House Slough several years ago and the City negotiated an agreement with the Lakeland Association to pump waste to the lagoon that was expanded.

Shanklin said the amount shown for the Robinsons Landing study for the sewer is \$3,800 and asked the reason for that exact amount. Huck said that was the amount of money that was left over from all the other projects and the cost is not really known. (Mayor Marley entered the meeting at this point.)

Sadler asked if the Robinsons Landing restrooms are considerably smaller. Huck said yes, it only has two water closets on each side where School House Slough probably has six. Shanklin said the size of the buildings is similar. Huck said the size may be similar but the number of water closets is different. Sadler said on Sunday he went to the ones at Robinsons

Landing and School House Slough, and the other two were locked up, but he remembered a smaller number of facilities at Robinsons Landing. Williams asked if there are more showers at School House Slough than at Robinsons Landing. Huck said Robinsons Landing has one shower in each of the mens and womens, and two water closets in the womens and one water closet and one urinal in the mens. Williams asked if there were two showers at School House Slough. Huck said either two or three on each side and multiple toilets and urinals.

Williams asked if the residents at Robinsons Landing have individual septic tanks. Huck said yes, septic tanks and leach fields, and there are no lagoons to serve any of that area. Williams asked if the cost of an additional septic tank at Robinsons Landing was known, or a way to increase the capacity. Huck said that was part of the reason for the analysis and that he was not sure that could be done since it is so close to the lake and the water quality issue. Huck said the ideal thought is to have no leach fields within 660 feet of the high water line. Warren said the restrooms and sewer system at Robinsons Landing are needed items but for the rest of it, it seems to be throwing money at a wall and hoping some of it sticks. Warren said you cannot start spending money various places and then have the plan returned showing it should have been spent elsewhere.

Purcell asked if a study was needed on the sewer system at Robinsons Landing before any expansion could take place. Huck said yes, to have a larger facility, you have to increase the sewage capacity, whether by a leach field or lagoon system; the City has built a couple of lagoons and the costs were \$60,000 to \$80,000. Huck said it has to be evaluated and the plan approved by DEQ. Purcell asked if a septic tank could be added. Huck said if that is an option, it would have to be pumped periodically. Purcell asked the cost of another septic tank and pumping and Huck said he did not know. Purcell said those items should be determined before funds are spent. Huck said Item Nine is to do the evaluation. Warren said it seemed that should be in the master plan where it would show if people needed to be spread out to the north and what the City would or would not do and look at the whole picture.

Williams asked if the septic tank system at Robinsons Landing is currently pumped out periodically. Huck said yes, it is pumped as a safe guard prior to the high use season. Williams asked Ihler if the City had the expertise in-house to determine if another septic tank system could be installed at Robinsons Landing. Jerry Ihler, Public Works/Engineering Director, said yes, we do have the expertise to analyze it and there may be a cost for soil analysis but it would be a matter of priority and scheduling. Shanklin said we have the best Public Works Department and Engineer Department in the State of Oklahoma and they have that expertise.

Shanklin suggested guidance to staff to find out about Robinsons Landing and show Council how the bathrooms would be renovated and if the water would properly drain. Shanklin said he would offer that as a motion and Sadler said he would second. Mayor Marley asked for clarification and Shanklin said his motion was to direct staff to come back with a comprehensive plan for those four restrooms and then do renovation.

Williams said Items Five and Seven are for rip rap but Item Five was deleted. He asked if those are needed. Huck said those were erosion controls around high use areas in the camp grounds. He said with the lake levels being high in the past few years, there are shelters at Fishermans Cove where 15 feet of the bank has been lost and the water is within 15 feet of the shelter, and if rip rap is not placed, the shelters could be lost. Shanklin asked if a fishing pier had been lost at Fishermans Cove. Huck said no and a break water had been done with tire reefs at that location; there is a boat dock and three private docks operated by the concession, although those need some repair. Williams asked if rip rap is needed at Lawtonka. Huck said it would be for erosion control and \$50,000 to \$75,000 could be done in this area at each lake. Williams said that appeared to be a high priority and \$10,000 was included for a sea wall but was deferred. Shanklin asked what the \$10,000 was for. Huck said it would be a combination of big rail road ties and rip rap rock, and the wooden sea wall construction allows boats to pull up without being damaged; 300 feet has been done at Lawtonka using the sea wall construction.

Purcell asked if Item 10 was the underground storage tank requirement and when it had to be removed. Williams asked if there was a fund available for that type of expense. Schumpert said there is no money in that fund but we would apply, and there will be two items on the next agenda, one being to accept the tank and the other to amend the contract with Zia Corporation to remove it, and the \$16,000 assumes there is no soil contamination. Shanklin asked how big are the tanks and if City crews would remove them and have soil testing done. Ihler said they are 3,000 gallon tanks, and Zia Corporation does the engineering and the upcoming agenda item is to have Zia prepare bids and have them removed. Shanklin asked if City crews wanted to do the work. Ihler said no, not when we are dealing with the Corporation Commission. Ihler said as to the availability of funds, when we remove the tanks, if there is no soil contamination, there is no requirement for remediation; the indemnity fund comes in where you have to do remediation due to contaminated soil, and if there is none, we could not submit for reimbursement. Ihler said the City is required to remove the tanks, and the indemnity fund comes into play if there is remediation, and there may be a \$5,000 deductible.

Purcell asked when the tanks had to be removed. Ihler said he thought it was December 31, 1998. Purcell said he agreed with the motion and suggested the \$16,000 be included for the tanks. Shanklin said the RFP should be done to determine the cost. Schumpert asked if the motion was to return plans to upgrade four restrooms. Shanklin said no, and that he would make his motion again.

Williams asked if all gas tanks on City property had been contracted out. Ihler said five tanks were removed two years ago and there was a contract for the engineering and environmental assessment and coordination with the Corporation Commission and bids were taken to physically remove the tanks. He said one tank was at the police station, two were at the Wastewater Plant and two were at the Lake Rangers Station. Ihler said there are three tanks at Public Works and a

proposal will be brought forward to remove them and instead have above ground tanks. Warren said the \$16,000 is a guess and if there is contamination, it could be a large expense. Shanklin asked if this would be in a separate item. Schumpert said it will be a separate item but the funding source is proposed to be the Lakes CIP.

Shanklin said his motion would be to allocate \$16,000 for the removal of the gas tanks at School House Slough and give direction to staff to come back with a plan that we can remodel and enlarge the one under concern at Robinsons Landing and that three members go look at the facilities and plans because there is a need for restroom facilities. Purcell asked if either restroom in Item One or Two is at School House Slough and Shanklin said no.

Huck said the restroom at School House Slough needs to be relocated, and some repairs are needed in the interim. He said the lake level is about a foot above the spillway, that area has a tendency to flood and it would behoove us to look at totally relocating the restroom but the cost could be \$60,000 or more if it is durable construction. Shanklin said it would be a long time before Council could find such funds given the other, immediate problems requiring attention. Shanklin asked if Mr. Waller would be responsible at all for the restroom. Huck said no, the way the lease is drawn, all the restrooms are the responsibility of the City.

Schumpert said when the lease was approved with Mr. Waller, there was a drawing and the arrangement was the City would accept the responsibility for asphaltting the public parking area. He said Waller intends to move the store to the east side of the current loading dock and have a store/pier arrangement; the new restroom would be beside the grassed area. Schumpert said that arrangement has been approved previously, although he did not know about the cost of the facility because the number of people that may be using it would be a factor and the master plan would be helpful in that regard. He said the current restroom would be kept serviceable until improvements are made by Waller. Shanklin said the City cannot spend \$100,000 on a restroom right now.

Williams asked that Mr. Meese, the Robinsons Landing concessionaire, be allowed to speak. Consensus was that his remarks should be related to the items being considered tonight.

Larry Meese said in March he talked to Don Pendergraph, Environmental Specialist at DEQ, and read from a letter stating that "on March 20, Don Pendergraph and myself met with you at the site to make evaluation of the area. At this time it appears that expansion of the system is possible if proper distances for DEQ regulations are maintained" and it goes on to say that he talked to Mr. Huck and Mr. Henson about this, so DEQ is aware of the possibility of expanding and their response was that it would likely be another septic tank and additional lateral lines, and that it should perc without too much problem.

Meese said they are barred from further expansion and cannot put in another single camp site until this is resolved so it is very important to him. He said the ten year funding plan shows no money spent in the area of Robinsons Landing. Meese said more and more people are coming there and they would like to expand, and possibly become a Good Sam camp ground. He said Huck had been looking into this and felt it could be worked out at a reasonable cost and asked that funding be set aside for this.

Beller asked if preliminary work had been done on the sewer system needs. Meese said DEQ indicated a cost of less than \$100 for a perc test and they could tell at that time if the system could be installed, and they initially felt it could be. Meese said seven lateral lines were originally installed and three were cut off because tree roots had clogged the line. He said the problem may be lessened if those three lateral lines could be used. Meese said the cost for a home septic system is about \$1,500, so the cost for one at Robinsons Landing may be \$1,500 to \$2,000 for a new septic tank and lines, and a little more to repair the other three lateral lines. He said that may resolve the problem, but if they could add showers and toilets, it would bring them close to where the other bathrooms are, and they have about half of what others have now. Williams said when staff looks at the bathrooms, all four should be considered as far as capacity and future growth, and contain facilities appropriate to their use.

MOVED by Shanklin, SECOND by Sadler, for staff to come up with a plan to upgrade or update the three restroom facilities, one at the east camp ground, one at Robinsons Landing, and one at the day use area at Lawtonka, and do what is necessary to hold the one together at School House Slough; approve \$16,000 for the fuel tank removal shown in Item 10; and approve Items 5, 7 and 8. AYE: Williams, Sadler, Purcell, Shanklin, Beller, Warren, Maples. NAY: None. MOTION CARRIED. Maples said she approved of all expenses except the study.

Note: Item 5 is \$10,000 for sea wall at Lake Lawtonka; Item 7 is \$2,500 for rip rap at Lake Ellsworth near Fishermans Cove and Collier Landing Campgrounds; Item 8 is \$6,200 to OSU for Lakes Master Plan.

2. Discuss preparation of the 1998-99 Budget and provide direction to the City Manager and the City staff. Exhibits: None.

This portion is inserted verbatim as follows:

Mayor Marley: I would assume, ladies and gentlemen, and I think you probably already agree, that this is very wide direction. In other words, were not talking about specific items, were just talking about some general guidance so he can come back to us and give us some sort of plan that will be a little bit more definitive as far as which way hes going. Yes.

Maples: The only guidance I have on the budget is absolutely no increase.

Mayor Marley: No increase in budget, OK.

Williams: Mayor, I brought all my books from last year, I think we need to be talking about this.

Mayor Marley: Well, unfortunately, we dont have time tonight, sir. Yes.

Purcell: My comments are similar to what Ms. Maples says that no increase, no increase in utility rates to balance the budget is my suggestion. Theyre not to come back with a budget that has an increase in any kind of utility rates, and that we use the same dollars that we had in the budget in 1997, with the exception of the step increases. Obviously weve got to take that into consideration, thats going to be an increase, but no other increases in the budget other than that.

Schumpert: If I understand you correctly, youre saying no increases in 200 or 300 series accounts. 100 series is the only areas you will consider?

Purcell: Oh, yeah, Im sorry, I misunderstood what you were saying. But the only things in the 100 is not to add new people, its just the step increases.

Mayor Marley: OK, thats another point.

Purcell: No adding new people.

Mayor Marley: No new hires, is that what youre saying?

Purcell: What Im saying is the only increase over and above the 1997 budget dollars is the extra dollars you need for step increases in both general employees and the others that are required by step increases.

Schumpert: Sir, we cant meet that, OK, thats, if you want to say to us, no new hires and no monetary increases other than step, we can live with that, but we have to be able to adjust our insurance and those kinds of things.

Purcell: Oh, yeah, we understand that.

Mayor: The personnel area is what hes talking about.

Purcell: Im talking about no increase in salaries other than step increases and no increase in employees. I understand the insurance and the other things.

Schumpert: Youre also saying no COLAs?

Purcell: Thats correct.

Maples: But with those increases, though, they come out of somebodys budget and not an increase in utility rates.

Purcell: Thats correct. What we should come up with, if you do that, depending on what you estimate the dollars to be, there should be a much, when we see it, there should be a much larger carry over when we see the initial budget, no, Im not talking about this year, Im talking about for the following year than we saw this year, correct? Because this year we saw like \$100,000 carry over; if you base it on the budget for this year, with the dollars available that you normally do and the estimates that Steve does, there should be a much larger carry over.

Schumpert: No sir, but, ....

Purcell: OK, but...

Schumpert: I understand what youre saying but...

Purcell: Im just saying what Im saying and Im not sure the rest of the Council agrees with that but thats kind of the guidance Ive got.

Schumpert: Youre saying no increase in utility rates, no new hires and no COLA.

Purcell: And that should help you in a couple other areas too that will be upcoming I hope that guidance will help you. You understand what that means.

Schumpert: Well, I understand what youre saying.

Mayor: OK, yes, Jeff.

Sadler: Theres been a lot of talk around town I expect in the last week or so about the City being more on-line, having a

web page or having council minutes, just as much as far as an image is concerned, as far as being acceptable to the community, even people not in Lawton that want to call up our web page and find out more about the city. I have no idea what the expense would be for something like that but I'd like to see us do some studies or try to figure out what it would take to be more on line.

Schumpert: Well, sir, the first thing it would take would be at least one new hire, and ...

Purcell: I think it's premature, Jeff, because all that stuff that's going on, that's what they're, that group is supposedly going to come up with.

Schumpert: There is a group out there called Vision that's meandering about web pages and image.

Sadler: Well, if they needed us to spend just a little bit of money when budget time came, I'd like to talk about it.

Mayor: I think you can address that a little later on as you go.

Purcell: If we keep to this, we'll have money to do those kinds of things, and if you want to add a person during the budget, you can do that.

Shanklin: Mayor, pass that sheet right there around. I want to talk about it when it comes my turn.

Mayor: OK, Randy.

Warren: I would just say ditto on the new hires and the rate increases, but also, as far as a web page is concerned, I think we do have the ability if needed in the future to put out an RFP for maintenance of the web site for the city to include the possibility that we could have Internet access as a city utility just charged on the utility bill which could be an all encompassing program, you know, it's a possibility.

Schumpert: So you're saying you would like to see a utility increase for a web page?

Warren: No, it wouldn't be an increase. That would be something that someone could choose to have.

Williams: Gil, keep one thing in mind, a utility increase is one thing, increasing fees, though, I think is on the table.

Maples: That's you talking, Richard, that's not others.

Williams: Well, I mean, you tell me, do you have a problem increasing a fee?

Maples: I'm not for any increase to the citizens, none.

Mayor: I think...

Williams: Well, you're just one.

Mayor: Yeah, that's right, but this is so general that you've got to give him some where to point to and if you don't like it, that's your chance when it comes up in the budget discussion to change it. But I think what you have to do is set some parameters for him so he knows where to go, I mean other than that it's sort of high flying, and I think these three things are probably the most critical as far as his concern as to how to put a budget together. Now if anyone doesn't agree to that, that's fine but later on then when you get to the budget workshops you can adjust it one way or another and say well, we're going to have to have a new hire for this so you change it to him at that time.

Williams: We've talked off and on about not so much maybe if you want to call it privatization or what but I would encourage you to look at areas where the city could possibly either increase services and or reduce costs by doing that.

Mayor: Well, I agree with you, I think it's incumbent upon the manager with this kind of guidance to look at that to come up with a more efficient system if there is one possible, and to reduce costs as much as possible, and it's going to cause him some heart burn in some of these areas but I think that's needed so that you get your initial blush to see what it comes out like and then you can modify it as you go down the line before you have your final budget say so in June.

Beller: Well, on the privatization issue, we sent them out on this task a year or so ago, we looked at the solid waste division and it was a total disaster what the Council saw after we went out and looked at that, so why send him on a mission that we know we're not going to accept? We're not going to privatize the fire department, we can't privatize the police department, we're not going to privatize solid waste I don't think, it's not, at least it wasn't the consensus of the council as we heard it the last time around, and it certainly puts, in my opinion, it puts a very, very bad feeling on those employees who think there might possibly be a privatization in their departments. It's ludicrous for us to set here and try to stir up people with privatization talk when we have no intention of doing that, at least I think the majority of the council. It's a good idea but it ain't time for it.

Williams: Let me respond to that if I can. I think there are, the city has a number of departments that do an excellent job, excellent, but, and I'll use information systems as one, I mean that industry is exploding at warp speed and this city doesn't

have the money to spend to get us up to where I think we need to be in some of those areas. Now that to me is an area that might be up for possible out sourcing and or privatization. Im not saying doing the solid waste or engineering or fire or police or anything like that, but there are some departments that could be. Bob and John have talked about mowing. Lets get us out of the mowing business, I mean, you know, those mowers that come before us for \$200 to \$300 to \$500 a pop, plus the maintenance on them and then someone to push them around, I mean, this body needs to have the guts to stand and look at the citizens and tell them that were doing everything humanly possible to make sure their cost of city government is in line and is the most efficient as possible.

Mayor: OK, yes, John.

Purcell: Well, Id like to comment on the grass one, theres a good example, I agree with Charlie, dont, were not talking about doing the whole department, but it may be cheaper to contract out grass mowing, for instance, a function within a department. Now, when you go out and do it, one of the reasons some of these things fail, you can make them fail, you can compare numbers that make it look like its cheaper to do it in house than it is to do it out house, contracting it out, so you dont approve them. And just because it didnt work last time, and Im not suggesting we go back to garbage collection, we know, I think were pretty satisfied thats not going to happen so lets not use it for that and I dont think the manager would do that, but something like grass mowing or even something like computer services might be looked at to out source, and if we can save \$100,000 by out sourcing grass mowing, maybe we ought to do that, I think we have other places that we could put the people that are in grass mowing into other jobs so I dont think theyre going to lose their jobs. Were not trying to do that but if we can save \$100,000, if thats the number, then we probably need to out source. If we save \$5,000, we probably ought to not out source, but I think we really do need to look at that.

Mayor: OK, I think Dicks doing some of that already, some of the mowing of the medians and all are already contracted out.

Purcell: We do but we have not to this day consolidated grass mowing and Ive been saying it for four years.

Mayor: But Im saying some of it is happening. Bob, you wanted to....

Shanklin: Yes, I gave you all a fact sheet if you would look at it a minute. This is ole doom and gloom. In 1978, our budget was, you see it was \$12 million; we had 70 to 75,000 people. In 1988 it was right at \$19 million and we had 80,000 people. In 1998 its gone to \$29 million or \$30 and I would say were still around 80,000 people. If you look at 2008 if we continue to do the same, why youre looking at \$40 million and youre looking at \$10 to \$12 million new dollars on top of the I & I. Now where are these funds going to come from? I knew this was coming for some time. Let me tell you this, the water distribution plant and the wastewater treatment plant, theyve been the same for ten years, been the same for ten years. Our water revenues are down right now \$250,000 for this fiscal year. Were looking at \$300,000 gain on February the 10th I hope as to the Christmas sales, thats when well find out about Decembers Christmas sales. But according to the people I talk to, theres 1,200 homes for sale. I think that its time that we tighten our belt. Youve got this sales tax that if it gets defeated, I know youre struggling with raising the utility and some of it has to be done but Council, Im telling you that we can cut, we can tell Mr. Schumpert that the budget will be the same but two and a half percent of that budgets going to the I & I and two and a half percent of that budget will do the step in grades. How you do it, you manage it, youve got \$30 million, get with it. That will give faith to the citizens out there that were doing our share. Were biting the bullet here because were going to be here in the year 2005 or whenever the budget goes up and water goes to a dollar a glass. Im trying to keep it from going to that point. We havent said anything about economic development and its in our hands, Council, we are the ones who have to promote it and every, mayor, every place hes been, every conversation Ive had with him, it doesnt look good, does it mayor?

Mayor: Well, it could look better. There are people looking but theres nobody coming right now.

Shanklin: I understand but I read in the Constitution I think it was Sunday how everything was really up to snuff, everybody is looking forward, well, our sales tax is down, folks. And weve got \$90 million in construction. Where is it? Doesnt that bother you?

Purcell: No, it doesnt, can I just interrupt right here?

Shanklin: Yes.

Purcell: One of the reasons I think, were looking, were really looking at one part. Theres two parts of this thing and I know you and me, weve gone over this before, but theres the sales tax and theres this thing called the use tax, and when you take the sales tax and quote the use tax and you add those up, were not behind, whereas last year there was very little use tax and I dont know how they distinguish in the terminology, maybe, between use tax and sales tax, but when you add the two together, we are ahead of last year, so some of the stuff that we used to call sales tax I think is showing up under use tax.

Shanklin: The other thing, how do we check our use tax? We have that authority, we can send people out on job sites to check use tax.

Purcell: Yes but I think that what youre saying is youre right that the total sales tax number is down for the year to date but the use tax is way up and when you add the two together, were above where we were last year so its not quite as bad.

Shanklin: I understand that, well, I was reading, the use tax wasnt in the paper that Dr. Gibson gave out but quoted Mr. Schumpert that it was normal. In a little bit Id like for you to explain to me whats normal about being flat, I mean, but

anyway. Anyway, Council, that is going to be the program that Im going to try and promote is that some place that the taxpayers that hey, weve got until July, lets do something to show that taxpayer out there that were doing our part. As I showed you in 78 through the year 1998, the twenty years, we havent done anything and Ive been part of it. Ive been part of it, Im not going to deny that, but look how its grown, but we havent grown. Our water sales, our water sales are up because we changed the rates but were not producing any more water. And I would like for the majority of Council to give Mr. Schumpert a thought that this may have to occur, that we may want to cut that budget five percent, the five percent that I mentioned, and its time for us to go to work, all of us, and I hope if somebody agrees with me that theyll say so.

Williams: I agree with you.

Mayor: I look at, and another thought, Bob, I look at that five percent, lets say a \$50 million budget, so youre looking at two and a half million dollars is what that would be roughly if my math is right, is that right, anybody check on that, pretty close? And I look at the, when you start talking about that in big numbers, youre almost looking at personnel, I mean, thats really where the numbers are, your personnel costs are...

Shanklin: 75% probably.

Mayor: Yes, most of our, OK, to get two and a half million dollars, assuming if that may be what it is out of roughly, I use \$20,000 as a package deal for an employee, an average employee, \$20,000, you know how many people you have to get rid of to get two and a half million dollars? A hundred people, more than a hundred people, but the problem is, you cant take them from the police, you cant take them from the fire, because people dont want that, so what youre down to is youre down to those people who are doing the service, those are doing services too, but youre down to the people on the street that are out collecting trash, fixing water lines...

Shanklin: How did they cut the figures down and cut their budgets then?

Mayor: Well, thats easy, they just cut people but if you cut people here, youre cutting the heart out of what people say is good. Youve got to cut the trash, youve got to cut the water people, youve got to cut, and you still, I dont think, can cut a hundred people.

Shanklin: But we can look at it, not to look at it is to me in error.

Mayor: Well, I agree.

Shanklin: We just want to keep building and building and building and weve never said hey, time out, time out, lets just see what can happen.

Mayor: Well, I think your budget....

Purcell: But thats what we are saying because, Bob, its misrepresentation, Im sorry, to go from 1978 to 1998 from \$12 million to \$30 million, of course it did. You were making \$50 a week in 1978 and now youre making a heck of a lot more than that so inflation eats up most of that and the number of people in the city is immaterial, yes, theres a small increase but it could have been exactly the same and we still would have had that. And I agree with what youre saying, but what were telling him to do basically is exactly what youre saying; were going to still grow, hes going to have to pay more for people, hes going to have to pay more for gas, hes going to have to pay more for fuel and all of this other stuff is more and were saying but you cant increase your budget, so were basically doing what youre saying. If youre saying take what we have in 1997 and cut it 5%, then youre really cutting about 10% out of the budget or 8%, I think youve got a real problem there.

Shanklin: OK, where are you going to find the \$12 million in the next seven or eight years because it will jump that much?

Purcell: Its going to jump. Itll jump because inflations going to keep growing. I dont know if itll jump \$12 million but its going to go up with no more people in the city and all youre doing is paying for inflation. You could keep the budget the same for the next two or three years, dont increase it, then somebody....

Shanklin: It ought to be tied to your sales tax. Your sales tax, use tax, all the taxes we have, all the revenues we have, should be tied to that, thats your barometer, your water revenue is a barometer of what youre doing.

Purcell: Right, so were saying dont increase it and so then if we dont increase the amount of expenses were going to pay on next year, and if we get more sales tax or if the water use goes up, then were going to have more left over for the following year.

Shanklin: Im worried as being a civilian, John, Im not, I dont have the job that you have and Im worried about the civilians out there that are tied to their properties, their rentals, and I have rentals, Im speaking more in terms of them that it will come to the point that water will be the highest in the State of Oklahoma right here unless we do something for economic development to offset some of it somewhere, were not doing any of this. Were promoting the sales tax to the year 2025. We shouldnt be doing anything over three or four years. Russia went through a 25 year program every other year for 50 years and finally went down. I just dont believe in doing this for 25 years, I just dont. I think we need to tighten the belt, get some money in a slush fund for those who are empowered to go after industry, economic development and give them some aid so that we can get some people in here. Theres nothing coming. You all, youve got an extension in your contract, I love



it, we just need about 50 more of those high tech jobs, but were going to have to help them. We havent touched anything that would earmark a fund a half percent or a quarter percent, half a cent would generate three million plus dollars. Two years, two or three years will be gone before you know it and somebodys going to come and say what can you do for me and Lawton has, weve got, well take them out there and show them our restrooms at Lake Lawtonka. We aint got one dime, we dont have a dime, dont even have a restroom. Thats my whole point, council, Im not going to come out of the works to defeat you but I just cant see the 25 year program. The communists did it, like I said, for 80 years, and finally they 25 year out. And there are so many things that can happen that they were held hostage for that penny and that sales tax and were holding hostage our retailers who are having to compete with Fort Sill when they put out a ticket buy at Fort Sill, no sales tax. Mr. Beller has one. Now that, thats not fair, that is not playing fair, I dont give a dam whos listening or who dont like it, but we still have to keep our people at least a little bit competitive, still got to have some money for economic development and tighten our belt and show our citizens that were going to do it. And that means Ill give up my, that twenty-five, what it is, whatever it is, Id give mine up whatever it is, \$3,000 a year, Id give that up, do anything that we can to help those that are trying to get something in here. Thank you sir.

Mayor: Thank you.

Williams: Gil, I know where you can get \$3,000, uh, for economic development.

Mayor: Is there any other guidance you want to give to the manager at this time for the preparation of the initial budget submission to you all. Yes, I know youve got some questions.

Williams: Let me just say a couple of other things. I was real, I think the staff did a great job of coming this past year with departmental initiatives and I would still like to see those things come before us because I think theres still opportunities for us to improve services and probably reduce costs as well so Id still like to see some departmental initiatives from the group.

Mayor: Yes, Randy.

Warren: Well, theres really not a lot of direction that we can give Mr. Schumpert when weve given him the direction that weve given him thus far, I mean, pretty much spend less is about all the direction that we can give him. We cant ask for anything new, thats for sure.

Mayor: OK, any further comment. Yes.

Schumpert: Well, sir, when we say, Im hearing two things when you all say no increase. Are you saying that we are limited to the dollar figure in the budget of this year or are you saying Im limited to whatever Mr., and, well, in the past, what Mr. Livingston and his people do is look in his crystal ball and they project all sources of revenue and that provides us the picture of the money we have basically to spend that year. That money is almost always, Im not aware of a year that that has been less than we had last year. So I need clarification. Are you saying I have only what I have this year in the budget to spend or only what he says I have to spend?

Purcell: Ill try to answer it if everyone agrees. Im saying you only have what you have in the budget this year because if he tells you what you have to spend, thats going to give you more surplus to do exactly what Mr. Shanklin is saying we ought to be doing without telling you to cut 5% so if he predicts a million dollars more than we had this year, thats fine, your carry over for the initial budgets going to be a million dollars higher than it is this year. My suggestion is you limit it to the budget as was done this year with the only increases being the step increases. If he predicts an extra million bucks, great, we may be able to do exactly what Mr. Shanklins talking about.

Shanklin: Another thing, Mayor, that \$3, soon were going to have a pick up for everybody. I dont know who we dont have yet but we need to get that list here, because that \$3, thats a million and that can go on that I & I and were saving the tax money, saving that tax out there when were really going to have to have it. I could take you back to a bond issue of \$125 million, they ought to be down on their hands and knees that it got defeated if we had that \$125 million bond issue rammed up some place.

Purcell: The only problem on the three bucks, three bucks is going to be the only money youre going to see in next years budget for capital outlay on any kind of equipment because when we tell him to do what were telling him to do the first thing is take it out of capital purchases and if we dont have the \$3 in there for that, youre not going to buy another piece of equipment, whether its pick ups or anything else and I think thats....

Shanklin: I think it we can get past the pick ups were all right.

Purcell: All right, maybe we should say no more pick ups.

Schumpert: We can certainly do that but you all need to understand that, I think theres some realities that we need to understand. First off, one of the realities, and I understand about the average income and Oklahoma being, I dont know, a couple of thousand dollars less than the national average and all those kind of things, know all the stories about, I mean Ive heard all the stories about the minimum wage jobs and sausage factories and prison jobs and all this, and I know all those stories, the fact of the matter, though, is that at some point in time, this group is going to have to tell the citizens that (cycled to next tape) charging more for the sewer rate, the sewer alone, than we charge for the entire utility bill, and

so at some point in time, we have to wake up to reality. The very reason, and Ill, again, I guess maybe Im like Mr. Shanklin, maybe, I dont intend to offend anybody but I think it needs to be said, the very reason that we have a \$61 million sewer problem in Lawton America is for the very thing that were saying to do tonight, and Im not, Im saying we can do that, but Im saying that we, when we counted on revenue sharing to carry this city, when revenue sharing went away, you look at those people out there and theyll tell you that our equipment, we went down so far in equipment that we had unsatisfactory fire hose. We had fire hose in this city that would not pass the test for use to put out a fire. Now, if you want to impact on the citizenry, then all you have to do is affect that ISO rate and that affects a tremendous amount of people because it affects every home owner in Lawton America. But, and as I say, we can do what you all are wanting to do. All Im saying is that when you do that, when 70 to 75% of your budget is people, and you want to give them two and a half percent plus the roll ups in all the other categories, then one, youre saying to the police and fire that this year, this year there are not going to be any increases. Now, we didnt say that last year and Ill make the same bet we had before with Councilman Purcell, we wont see it this year, but aside from that, the place its going to come out of is the guts, you know, were not taking it out of the fat around this fat mans belly, were taking it out of the sinew and the muscle that we have to do our jobs, i.e., the maintenance and operation monies and the capital outlay. Were now, you know, part of the reason that we had the three people riding around in pick ups is because that was the only pick up that ran. The way we got those three people to that job was in that pick up.

Shanklin: Im here to tell you because I followed them several times...

Schumpert: Now in the other cases, we had equipment down in the shop, and we still have a couple of pieces, that they have stopped manufacturing parts for. They dont make the thing any more, you cant, if you want the parts, youve got to go get it built some place. We dont need to, I mean, and everybodys saying, well, you know, were in pretty good shape right now. Well, the reason were in pretty good shape is because you all have seen fit to make some adjustment and make some of those hard calls, and I think some of the members of this council, and certainly some of the members of the previous council, said that we should increase the utility rate by a amount every year. Well, Im saying, you really need to consider that. Is it our utility rates, and all the rates we have, all the charges we have in Lawton, Oklahoma, are less expensive than any other city, so we can do that, and Im here to tell you that where youre going to be cutting the monies and will be taking monies are from those very areas that are making us do what were doing. And to counter what Mr. Shanklin is saying about the Pentagon, weve gone through that before every war weve had thus far. When we went to Vietnam, we had the same kind of melancholy attitude that they had before and what happened was we almost got, well, we got chased out of there because we didnt have the men, the equipment nor the training to make it because they said, whats the war we got now, why do we need all these people? Well, the reason that there wasnt a war is because we had the people. Why is our crime down now? Because we have a pretty, our police department is almost average, its not above average, its almost average in what we need in our police department. Were about five people short.

I will tell you that Woody Woodall in the street department has less people today working in the street department than he had when I worked for the city in 1977 and I defy anybody to identify less streets in Lawton today than there was in 1977. So, I just think, I think you all need to do that but now, let me get off my soap box and ask some questions. One, last year we had the department heads come before you and make a presentation of their budget and simply, I think in essence, explain how theyre organized and also what they intend to do with those funds. Do you all wish to have that again this year, is that of benefit?

Maples: I dont see why we need to do that if were going to fall within the guidelines that weve provided. I mean they can come with the budget, no increases, I really dont care what they do with their money, as long as theres no increases.

Purcell: I dont know, I dont think, the organization I dont think we need again, but I think we need to know, because we may decide what theyre going to do is not where we want it and we may want to move some money. I think we could speed up the process by not going through the whole organization deal again, unless theres a major change in organization and I think we have one department I believe that were going to see a change in organization.

Mayor: Well, I think too what you might have is have those people available but not necessarily making a presentation unless a question comes up and that way you reduce the time down.

Schumpert: I think the questions already been answered about department initiatives. You all want those again this year. Weve done a five and ten percent document, that document is somewhat bogus because its based on the budget that we had presented in the past and has largely been ignored because you all have listened to the departments and done, as Mr. Purcell said, made some modifications. Its a big exercise for us and it appears to not have any benefit. I dont even know how many council members use the document. I would prefer not to do that document this year.

Williams: Dont do it.

Purcell: Agreed, dont do it.

Schumpert: Now the other one is that we have a document which we call, for lack of a better term, basically a budget support document that does explain things like Waurika water and utility rates, historical pay raises, etc. We would intend to do that again this year, is that....

Purcell: Thats very helpful when youre doing the budget.

Schumpert: OK, I dont, Steve, is there any other documents that we put together other than those? OK. What Im intending to do then is once we get the budget together, well schedule departments and then you all can say well, no, we dont want to hear the City Clerk, we dont want to hear this, or those kind of things and we can mark them off. And the monies, when we say no increase, were saying no increase in the bottom line dollar. OK.

Shanklin: The only thing Ive got is what muscle did we destroy when we built the wastewater treatment plant for \$22 million, but was that the fat.

Schumpert: Sir, the story on the wastewater treatment plant...

Shanklin: I know the story.

Schumpert: No sir, Im saying in 1977 about or in the 1970s when I was with the city before, Benham and Blair designed a 15 mgd plant for the City of Lawton. We bid it and it was too costly so we cut and we built part of it and since 1977 we have, in my Oklahoma vernacular, bubble gummed and bailing wired that sucker and we have spent far more on that plant than if we would have paid twice what Benham and Blair projected for that plant attempting to get it, and what we have out there today is a plant that is like three sizes of garden hose, you have a four inch going into a two inch going into a four inch going into a two inch, and yet were now spending more money to fix that problem. We had a, we did a tennis court in Lawton, Oklahoma, or a tennis complex and it was too much. So what did we cut out of that tennis court? We cut out the clay stabilization. What was the result? The result is we now have a tennis court complex that has cracks all in it and it is unusable for tennis because tennis cant be played on cracked surfaces. Now it looks nice and its got lights and we can point to it and say theres a tennis complex, and as long as the person doesnt walk on the court, they can say, hey, I want to come to Lawton because theres a nice tennis complex but you cant play tennis there. Every time we cheap something, we end up with something like weve had out there and we end up spending more money in the long run on that thing than we would have spent had we gone ahead and bitten the bullet and put down the money were supposed to do which is what were doing I think, and thats one of the things Ive been, I think myself personally proud of the councils I have worked with is that in my past experience councils have done that. The \$61 million sewer project, were recognizing that we have a problem and were attacking the problem and we will have for the first time a sewer maintenance program thats effective and we will be able to fix our sewers and we wont have a \$61 million problem again. I think its intended as part of the cent and a quarter, if the citizens pass that, they need to understand that were going to do the same thing with our streets and the same thing with our water distribution system. Quite frankly I think most of the people around this table know it that our water distribution system is in as bad a shape if not worse than the sewer system. The difference is when you have something under pressure, it squirts out, so you go out and fix it, I mean youve got to fix it because otherwise water runs everywhere so you got to fix it, but its in terrible shape.

Weve got the same exact problems. Lines are undersized, they go to the wrong places. We had a deal the other day where it runs, you know, back in ought three, they just ran it across the section line, worked for everybody, and now weve built a slough of houses over it and we have that all over town. So, as I say, Ive been proud to be associated with the councils Ive been because we have in fact attacked the problems and weve put money where we need to and weve put, we havent been excessive and we havent gone out for the Cadillacs but we sure havent Model Td it with a bid on small tires or something. We have actually done what we needed to do and for the first time, I see a light at the end of the tunnel if we continue because the essential things we have to do is provide transportation, a system of transportation, we need to provide water, safe water and adequate water, and we need to provide sewer systems, police and fire, and I think were doing an excellent job in that these days, but that takes money and yet at the same time it takes money, were still the lowest, we still have the lowest overall cost to the citizens of any place in Oklahoma.

Shanklin: Ill tell you about Camp, Dresser and McKee some day, thats the other part of that wastewater treatment plant if you dont know about it.

Schumpert: No sir, I know about that.

Mayor: OK, any more for the good of the cause?

Williams: Just a comment regarding an article that was in Sundays paper and some kudos to Ms. Covert for writing this article about the reduction in the utility bills for the elderly. I just need to make sure I have in my mind straight the discount that elderly slash low income slash handicapped people can receive from the city. Gil, would you explain that to me?

Schumpert: Sir, Ill have Mr. Livingston.

Williams: Steve, is it \$16,000, if a homeowner, if a utility customers income is \$16,000 or \$15,000 or less and they are what, 65 years of age?

Livingston: Or disabled.

Williams: Or disabled. OK, what if theres a 35 year old disabled person? Do they get a discount?

Livingston: If youre disabled, yes. If youre disabled and have less than \$16,000, thats the household income, I mean, if theres two of you and somebody makes \$60,000 a year, then you wouldnt, this household would not qualify.

Williams: Combined household income \$16,000 or less, 65...

Livingston: 65 or disabled. You have to have \$16,000 or less in income and be 65 or disabled.

Williams: OK, and the disabled can be any age with \$16,000 or less, OK. The only other question I would ask, in this article it talks about people that are having hard times making their payments to the city can make special arrangements with the utilities division. It says something to the effect that they have to personally come in to do this. Can they not do this through the telephone?

Livingston: We usually, right now we dont make those arrangements over the phone but we ask them to come in so we can, so they can sign their arrangement that they make because sometimes we make arrangements that people disagree on what the arrangements were so its been helpful to have a, we have a little document that we say youll pay me \$15 on Friday and then in three weeks youll pay me the \$15. We make those kinds of arrangements but they are a little agreement that we make between individuals.

Vincent: Sir, I think its important to note that those are contracts and they have to be signed. Theyre making a time payment contract.

Williams: Why is it a contract?

Vincent: Theyre making an agreement to pay a bill, thats a contract by definition.

Williams: OK, why would we ask a homeowner to enter into a contract with us as opposed to just taking their word over the telephone, putting it up into our computer system that we talked to Mr. and Mrs. Homeowner this date, we decided upon this agreement, this is how its going to be, and if that agreements not upheld then we go and take other actions.

Livingston: I think we could probably work out something like that but right now the way were working with the customers, it has been helpful to have it in writing because we have disagreements and we have to go out and turn off the water or something and they say no, we didnt agree to that and thats not at all what we understood.

Williams: It just appears that along this user friendly notion...

Livingston: I think it might be something that we could look at. We have some rules on the agreements, you can, you cant have more than two in one year and you cant have entered into an agreement in the last four months, so we kind of limit by our own rules so our own staff will have some guidelines on what the city expects or these agreements and we have done some things to try to do more business over the phone and of course, when you do those things, you also have some more problems.

Williams: It appears to me, of course Im a pretty simple minded person but it appears to me in the long run we would reduce staff time, paperwork, confusion, people standing around wanting to make deals with us on the past due accounts, frustration of customers, you know, if we just made the deal over the phone and said OK, youll live with this, and hopefully weve already got some kind of deposit on record with them and were going to be using that and we do have the hammer to cut the water off.

Livingston: We can look at that and talk about it. That certainly is something that we could look at.

Williams: Just a suggestion. I know some other utilities are doing that.

Livingston: Were having a hard time getting all the phones answered so its not guaranteed that you get to call in, I mean, were working on that problem too, getting enough people to handle the customers is kind of a problem right now.

Schumpert: With another person Im sure they could do that.

Williams: Well, take it a step further, Gil, maybe out sourcing that.

Mayor: OK, yes, Mr. Shanklin.

Shanklin: Mayor, I saw a letter that Mr. Ihler had written to Bar-S, I think...

Schumpert: Mr. Tucker wrote it, sir.

Shanklin: On the sewer line?

Schumpert: Oh, no, youre right, sir, that was Mr. Ihler.

Shanklin: I thought I could read but...

Schumpert: No, theres a new letter.

Shanklin: But any way, I think that a lot of people are concerned that were getting the britches put on us like Altus did to Bar-S and the reason I think Altus got it put on them a little bit because they werent under the same guidelines as we were due to their size and just maybe didnt really belly up to the negotiating table tough enough but what were actually saying is they cant run a by-pass line into our sewer system and thats for the citizens out there that are worried that they can overload us or put chlorine on us, they cant do it if this comes about and Im satisfied that this will come. Have you heard from that? That was my, really what I wanted to hear, Jerry.

Ihler: We sent the second or third letter to them. They have not responded to that yet.

Shanklin: They have not responded, OK. I hope all the council say that. Did you have a chance to see it? OK. Thats it for me. Thank you, Mayor.

Schumpert: I think everyone needs to be aware that we do have the gates open at both Ellsworth and Lawtonka based on the rain we got in the water shed. Remind you that the regular council meeting is next Tuesday. The other announcement I have is that Mr. Baker and I will be going to the semi-annual, well actually the annual city managers training conference in Stillwater so well be out of the net next Thursday, Friday and Saturday; Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, and Mr. user friendly Livingston will be in charge so he can get those things done. Just a reminder of the meeting next week.

Williams: Mayor, one other thing that I, indulge the Council, we had to do some pumping this past summer specifically from the standpoint of having an agreement with, is it the Oklahoma Water Resources Board that we keep the level of the lakes at a certain level? Can we not go back and renegotiate that or talk to those people about, I mean theres plenty of water everywhere I think but we ended up having to pump and still, thats just a transfer cost into the customers utility bill but I mean if we can alleviate that, that would help reduce some cost to the customers.

Shanklin: Well, the answer to that is thats Council Policy 10.2 I think and that is council policy and you filed that with the Oklahoma Water Resources Board so theyll expect you to honor it.

Williams: Well, maybe we should change that.

Shanklin: Ill stand corrected if thats not true but they didnt come down and tell us.

Mayor: I think the Water Resources Board controls the level of the lake, if Im not mistaken, theyre the ones that say how high you can have it.

Ihler: The Water Resources Board controls our gate operation policy. The pumping policy is a council policy, I believe, and we are looking at, that was brought up a couple of months ago and we have been looking at that and gathering data over the last two years and comparing if it would make a difference to change the pumping policy, what were looking at, instead of the three foot at one time of year and five foot another time of year, just going straight four foot all the time to see if it would change any of the pumping requirements. We are looking at that and should have something back in about two months.

Mayor: Anything else for the good of the cause. Thank you. Is there a motion to adjourn and second. Please call the roll. (end verbatim)

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.